

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,954	01/10/2006	Werner Pfeiffer	50244	3594
	7590 04/06/200 ABRAMS, BERDO &	EXAMINER		
1300 19TH STI SUITE 600	REET, N.W.	POPOVICS, ROBERT J		
WASHINGTON,, DC 20036			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1724	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
31 DAYS		04/06/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summany	10/563,954	PFEIFFER, WERNER				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Robert J. Popovics	1724				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONED	I. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status		ì				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 De	ecember 2006.					
· _ · _ ·						
·= ·	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
·	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>8-19</u> is/are pending in the application.	4)⊠ Claim(s) 8-19 is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
8) Claim(s) 8-19 are subject to restriction and/or e	8) Claim(s) 8-19 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers		·				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		d in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau	, ,,					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not received	d.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 10/563,954

Art Unit: 1724

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

Species	Corresponding Drawing Figures
1	2, 2a & 2b
2	3 & 3a
3	4 & 4a

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a). Presently, none of the claims appear to be generic

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features as discussed in Applicant's specification.

Art Unit: 1724

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Robert J. Popovics at telephone number (571) 272-1164.

Robert James Popovics
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1724